

7  
11

A  
PARALLEL:  
Wherein it appears, that the  
SOCINIAN  
Agrees with the  
PAPIST,

If not exceeds him in  
*Idolatry, Antiscripturism and Fanaticism.*

By FRANCIS FULLWOOD, D. D.  
and Arch-deacon of Totness in Devon.

*Thinkest thou this O man, that judgest them which do such things,  
and dost the same, that thou shalt escape, Rom. 2. 3.*

*Happy is he, that condemneth not himself in that thing which he  
alloweth, Rom. 14. 22.*

IMPRIMATUR,

May 16. 1693.

R. Barker.



London, Printed for A. and J. Churchill, at the  
Black Swan in Pater-Noster-Row. 1693.

A  
PARALLEL

Wherein it appears that the

2001

Agrees with the

PAPIST

It not exceeds him in

Antiquarium und Bibliothek

and Arch-deacon of Totnes in Devon.

1/2

36:00

REPORT

A. Barker.

5901 21 12.15.

Black & white in 2nd-Volume-Book, 1893.

**TO THE**  
Most Reverend Father in God,

**JOHN**  
LORD Arch-Bishop of Canterbury,  
And Primate of all ENGLAND.

**FRANCIS FULLWOOD**

Presents with all Humility, to Dedicate this  
following short Discourse, touching Socini-  
anism, &c.

**I** *T would be an unpardonable vanity in me, to  
imagine, either that the World needed my Ob-  
servation, how Seasonable and highly Accep-  
table His GRACE's late Vindication of our  
Lord's Divinity and Incarnation was, or, my Re-  
commendation of it, could I find words worthy to  
do it.*

*Yet thus much I cannot forbear to utter, that  
'tis a Rare thing to find such Condescension,  
such Candour and such Charity even towards  
the Enemies of our Common Faith, as well as to  
Friends of it, in a person of the Highest Station:  
Whereby, indeed he shews himself forth, as an*

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

Eminent Head, *not only Adorning, but Influencing and Animating by an admirable example, the great Body of our Church under him.*

If I may presume to speak my mind in a few words more, the strength of Reason is so dextrously managed in those four Excellent and Incomparable Sermons, that it will not be easie to answer them, the two former of them have driven both the Arian and Socinian Reason, to palpable Non-sence: And the Two latter, have given the World so reasonable and satisfactory account of the Christian Oeconomy, that all their idle Ideas and imaginary pretences to the contrary, are Deaded at the Root, and put to silence in the Grave without hope of a Resurrection, at least, in the same Body.

The World is a sensible Witness of the truth of this, to which I was provoked by the strange assurance of some amongst us, having no farther design in it then the Publick advantage; no, not so much as to gain his GRACE's Countenance and Protection of this small Pamphlet (the usual pretence of such Dedications:) But I most humbly beg His GRACE's pardon for the boldness of it: and pray heartily, that GOD would long preserve His Person and succeed all His Excellent Endeavours, in the Government, and for the good of this Poor Church.

Lifton near Dorchester,

April 25. 1693. A



TO THE  
READER.

WHAT I have charged the *Socinians* with, *viz.* That they are equally guilty of *Idolatry*, *Antiscripturism*, and *Fanaticism*, with the *Papist*, if not more hainously; is no more then what their Learned Adversaries do generally *twit* them with. They have indeed done it *obitèr*, or more by the by, and I have more largely undertaken to prove it upon them in the following Sheets.

The *SOCINIAN* stands Indited here of those three great *Offences* in Religion; and methinks 'tis but reasonable to expect, he should answer to this Charge before he proceeds any farther to disturb our *Common Faith*, with his novel and nice Disputes and Quarrels about particular Points.

If he think himself concern'd so to do, I would advise him to begin with the *First Article* of the Inditement, and clear himself and

## To the Reader.

his Cause from Idolatry, in the fence, we charge it upon the Church of Rome.

More plainly, That he would Consider and *Speak out* unto these two Propositions, *viz.* 'That to give the Worship due to the *Supream God* to a *Creature* is *Idolatry*. *2ly.* That 'tis *Lawful* and therefore no *Idolatry*, to give the *Worship* due to the *Supream God* to *Jesus Christ*.

These two Propositions divide the *Unitarians*, as they call themselves into *Two Parties*: One of them affirms the *First*, and the other the *Second*, as I have observed; and in my Opinion, both of them do their parts against each other unanswerably: And if both be found so far in the right, I hope neither of them will see Cause to deny the *Conclusion*; *That then Jesus Christ is more then a mere Creature*, that is, the *same with the Supream God*.

However, if any think themselves engag'd to persist in the denial of either of those *Two Propositions*, for the saving of their Cause, when we hear what they can say, I doubt not, but they will have a farther and a fuller Answer if need be. *The Good Spirit lead us into all Truth.*

# THE INTRODUCTION.

The Design Stated and brought to an Issue.

**T**HE SOCINIAN values himself much for his Opposition to Popery; and indeed some of that Name, have managed it in many considerable Articles, with great Reason and Merit; and were I such an Unitarian, as he pretends to be, I should esteem it more agreeable and less Scandalous to be called a Jew, or a Turk, or an Infidel, than so bad a Christian as the Papist is.

But the Socinian hath one very dear and darling Opinion, and is a Man of so much Reason and Resolution, that if Reason in the Service of his Hypothesis require it, he seems not to stick at any thing, tho' it savour never so rankly even of Popery it self.

Yea, tho' the things themselves abstractedly considered, are the Objects of his professed Hatred and Detestation: And though they bear the burthen of the Socinian charge against Popery; and tho' he upbraids the Protestant with some degrees of the same guilt; yet when the grossest of those things appear necessary for the Maintenance of his Cause, the Popery vanisbeth, the Opposition ceaseth, and with great Friendship, the things otherwise detested, are entertained and embraced, are openly professed and practiced, and pleaded for, with all imaginable Reason and Zeal.

## The Introduction.

*Now, That I may justifie what I have said, 'tis observable, that there are three small Peccadilloes, which lie pretty near the Root and Essence of the Papacy, in the Judgment of the Socinians themselves, wherein (for the State of their Cause no doubt) they do plainly Symbolize with, if not out-do the very Jesuit. These have respect to the Term of their Worship, the Rule of their Faith; And Lastly, the very Foundation of their Religion, and are no less or greater than Idolatry, Antiscripturism, and Fanatical Enthusiasm. In short, my present charge upon the Socinian is this; that he agrees with, and even goes beyond the Papist in all these, viz. Idolatry, Antiscripturism and Fanaticism, or Enthusiasm; all which, in the three Chapters following, I shall endeavour to prove and demonstrate in a fair and just Comparison betwixt them, which is all my present intention and business. For I must leave the Merits of the Socinian Cause at large, to the Undertaking promised by the Excellent and Learned Dean of St. Pauls, who the World knows, will perform it thoroughly and effectually, and earnestly desires and expects it.*

---

CHAP.

## C H A P. I.

*The Socinian compared with the Papist in point of Idolatry.*

## S E C T. I.

**T**HE First Part of my designed Task is this, by comparing the *Socinian* and *Papist* with respect to the Term of their Worship; to shew, wherein the *Socinian* agrees with, and out-does the *Papist*, even in the point of *Idolatry*.

Now, 'tis evident, as well by the Light of Nature as Revelation, that the *Secundo formale*, the very Reason and Nature of *Idolatry* lies in this, the giving that Worship that is due to God alone, that is Divine and truly Religious Worship, to the Creature: And for this very reason, we charge the *Papacy*, with the guilt of the horrid Sin of *Idolatry*. Now, if the *Socinian* be found to profess and practice the same thing; that is, to give Divine and Religious Worship due to God only to a mere Creature in his own Judgment, as our Saviour is, it cannot be any breach of Charity or Justice, to charge him with the guilt of *Idolatry* in General, or in Special, with the same kind of *Idolatry* we charge upon the *Papist*.

The *Papist*, when he Worships the *Host*, would excuse himself, because he believes it to be God; yet the Learned Men of that Communion do acknowledge upon a Supposition, that there is no *Transubstantiation* of the Elements, such Worship of the *Host*, is at least *Material Idolatry*: But how shall the *Socinian* be excused even from *Formal Idolatry*, tho' our Saviour be indeed God as he is, while they believe him to be but a Creature, and yet give him the Worship due to the Creator.

This



This is some aggravation, but more is added if we allow the *Papist's Distinction*, of the kinds or degrees of their Worship proportionably to the various Objects of it. *Doulia Hyperdoulia, & Latria*: the latter of which, they deny to any Creature, and count it peculiar to God alone: And tho' they believe, that the *Mother* of our Lord, hath so great Power with God, and over her Son; yet they say, that she ought not to be Worshipped with *Latria*, or the highest kind or degree of Worship: And their Learned Men affirm, that to give *Latria* to any Creature, is to be guilty of *Idolatry*.

But, seeing the *Papist* do formally and Actually pay the same kind of Worship to Creatures, that is due to God, tho' different in Degree, as certainly they do, (call it by what name you please) their distinctions in *Doctrine* cannot acquit their *Practice* from *Idolatry*: For Religious Worship of the same Kind, with that which is due to God only, is *Latria*: and therefore, to give it to a Creature, must be *Idolatry* by their own Definitions.

But our *Socinians* are not so meal-mouth'd. They professedly in their very *Doctrine*, as well as *Practice*, they allow Divine Adoration and Worship truly Religious, that is *Latria*, to one; that, they say, is a mere Man. This they do, without *Distinction* or reserve; and consequently, their *Idolatry* is more absolute, bare-fac'd and Inexcusable.

*Aquinas* teacheth, that the *Image* of the Cross may be Worshipped with *Latria*. A very wild Proposition; but he hath the slight to make the Worship of the *Image* to pass through it, and the Cross and our *Salvation*; and terminates in God: Yet we say his *Doctrine* is *Idolatrous*; do not the *Socinians* plead the same in effect, when some of them say, the Worship terminates in God the Father, which they equally pay to Christ as *Image* and *Substitute*: But if they give Divine Honour to him, as a distinct Person and separate Object from God the Father; and affirm, that the same Honour is due to Christ, that is due to God the Father; and that the Supreme God hath given his own Glory to the Creature Christ: Is not their *Idolatry* more gross and fullsome than the worst of *Papists*?

In a word, our Learned Men have demonstrated sufficiently, that *Popish Idolatry* justifies the *Idolatry* of the *Heathens*. And in my observation, the *Idolatry* of the *Socinians* does not only justify but exceeds them both too and that of their Fathers, the *Arians*. To make this evident, I crave my Readers patience and pardon, while I make a little digression; which yet I hope, he will not think impertinent to my main Design.

## S E C T. II.

*Socinians greater Idolaters then Pagans or Arians.*

**T**HE *Papist* justifie *Pagan Idolatry* as much as they can, by giving Divine and Religious Worship, tho' they pretend 'tis in a lower degree, to Angels and dead Men; for the wiser Heathen pretended the very same: They accounted their *Demons* the Ministers of God; secondary, Inferiour Gods; a middle sort of Intercessors, *Dei facti*: The Supreme God, they said, was the Maker of them: Whom therefore they stild *Deum Pater*, τὸ αὐτὸν καὶ θεὸν καὶ πατέρα. Just as the *Socinians* term our Saviour; they say, they were Gods Deputies and Officers, to Govern under him. Conformably, as 'tis observed out of *Hierocles*, these inferiour Gods were to be Worshiped indeed; yet but with an *Inferior* and middle kind of Worship, called *Doulia*: But the higher kind of Worship, or *Latria*, was due only to the *Supream* God: and they were so careful to maintain that Distinction, both with respect to the Objects, and the Worship, that Caution was given to the People (this is more I fear than the *Papist* do) not to give their inferiour Gods more Honour then was consistent with the Dignity God had given them. *Hieron.* pag. 10.

Doth not this Care and Caution used by the *Pagans* in their Idolatry reproach, condemn, and aggravate the more rash and confused practice of *Socinians*? These affirm boldly enough, that, tho' our Saviour is a *meer* Man, a *dead* Man, and only a God by Office, and not so by *Nature*; that is, a mere Creature, tho' Gods *Substitute*, yet they allow him equal Honour and Worship with the great God his Maker, without the niceness of distinction or limitation.

As

As for their Fathers the *Arians*, they might have learn'd the like Caution from them too. The Ancient *Arians* held Christ to be the great *Gods Instrument*, and not God himself: And upon this principle they perform'd to the Sacred Trinity *Unequal Honours*, as the Orthodox charged them, and they could by no means be perswaded to Worship with equal Worship the Son and the Father; because they believed *Christ* was but a Creature, or a made God. As *Fulgent. Greg. Nyss. and Cyril. Alex.* have observed. Now are not our *Socinians* much wiser then their Parents? For, tho' they have far viler thoughts of the Person, Birth and Nature of Christ, than the *Arians* had, yet by what rule of proportion I know not, they allow him as much higher and greater Honour; and like men of deeper Reason, plead that equal Honour is due to Christ the Son and the Father, from that very Text that the *Arians* expressly say was mistaken to that purpose, as those Fathers observe also.

If we should enquire what should be the reason, why both the *Papist*, and *Pagans*, and *Arians* too, are so careful to distinguish of the Objects and Degrees of their Worship, what reason can offer it self but this? namely, to secure themselves from the charge and guilt of *Idolatry*. They all agreed in the proposition; that those that give the same honour to any Creature that is due to God, is *Idolatry*. They all agreed in this Proposition, that leaves our *Socinian* without excuse.

'Tis plain in the Holy Scriptures, God would preserve his People from *Idolatry*, by that first and great Command, which is but a beam of the light of Nature; *Thou shalt have* (that is, thou shalt Worship) *no other God but me, or before me*; 'tis as if he had said, this is *Idolatry*, and *Spiritual Adultery*, my jealousy will not endure it. The same great Argument wherewith our Saviour resisted, refused, and repell'd the Devil, when he was Tempted by him to commit *Idolatry*. It is written, *thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

I call this great Principle, a *Beam of the light of Nature*, and the reason of Mankind, seeing not only *Jews, Mahometans* and *Arians*, but even *Pagans* and *Papists* as well as *Protestants* are united in it, and concur together to condemn and aggravate the *Idolatry of Socinians*.

The

The just Conclusion of the whole is this ; that by the evident Testimony of *Scripture* and *Nature*, and by the joint and unanimous consent of all the *World*, besides themselves, the *Socinians*, by allowing the same Worship to the Creature, that is proper and peculiar to the great God, are pronounced guilty of the most scandalous and foulest *Idolatry*.

### S E C T. III

*Socinians allow Religious Worship without Distinction to a Creature.*

PERhaps it may be yet thought requisite, to enquire a little farther into two things. 1. Whether the *Socinians* do indeed allow Divine and Religious Worship, as such without distinction to a Creature. 2. If so? Why they do it? These things well examined the Argument may be somewhat clearer.

1. To begin with the *First* of them, That *Socinus* and his Adhearents and Party do allow such Worship to a meer Creature in their own Opinion, cannot be doubted by any that read their Books, and know their Opinion of our *Saviour*, and the Honour and Worship they allow him, and argue for.

I know there is a *Party* that go under the Name of *Socinians*, that deny our *Saviour* ought so to be Worshipped, for this very reason, because he is a *Creature* ; and joyn with us in charging the guilt of *Idolatry* upon those that do so ; these we may have something to say to by and by ; but as for *Socinus* and his Party, I would lay this Argument before them, and desire their plain and honest answer to it. Those that give Divine Honour to a Creature are Guilty of *Idolatry* ; but *Socinians* as well as *Papists*, give Divine Honour to a Creature, therefore they are both guilty of *Idolatry*. The *Papist* denying only the second Proposition by distinguishing their Worship, allow the first ; and indeed their Learned Men are exprels, that to give *Latria* to any Creature is *Adolatry* : And tho' they generally confound and neglect their distinctions in their Practices, yet that consideration farther confirms their Concession of the first Proposition, *viz.* That 'tis *Idolatry* to

C

give

give Divine Worship or *Latria* to a Creature; seeing they choose rather to deny plain and manifest matter of fact, and bear any Contradiction betwixt their Doctrine and Practice, then dare to question a Proposition, that is Self-evident to all Mankind, as the first Proposition in the Argument is.

But, which Proposition will our *Socinian* deny, sure not the *Minor*; that they may not give Religious Worship to a Creature. For they say, Christ is no more, and yet allow Religious Worship to be given to him.

Resp. ad

Bland.

Tom. 2. P.

716.

*Socius* himself speaks home (*Constanter asserimus & quidem jure*) We constantly affirm, that we may of right direct our prayers to Christ, and tho' he can find no command for it; yet he infers, a Necessity of praying to Christ, because of the Kingdom Power and Government given to him.

Let their publick Catechism witness for them, they having granted Divine honour due to Christ, they ask wherein it consists; and answer, in Worshipping and Praying to him: and say, farther, 'tis our Duty to Worship him: and then that severe and damning sentence against their Brethren that deny it is pronounced. Seeing Christians, say they, are described as such as call upon the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, 'tis easy to understand, that those that will not do it are no Christians; Cat. Rac. s. 6. c. 1. p. 88. 92. Thus, they freely and fairly grant the Two Propositions: but what do they say to the first, that Divine Worship paid to a Creature is *Idolatry*? Here they hesitate, and seem a little afraid to speak out, least they should seem either to fight with a Beam of the Sun, or pronounce themselves *Idolaters*.

Here *Socius* himself seems to be at some loss, and returns back to the second Proposition, and forbears to consider Christ as a Creature, while he is the Object of Divine Worship, and to respect him so far a God, as to be fit to be Worship'd. *Cum necesse sit* (saith he) *cum cujus nomen in vocis pro deo competente sensu colere, &c.* But will *Socius* say, that this his God, whom he Worships with Divine Worship meaning Christ, is not a Creature still? O yes, this strikes at the Foundation, he is a Creature still. How then comes it to pass that 'tis no *Idolatry* to Worship him with Worship due only to God, that is no Creature. And how shall the first Proposition stand good, that 'tis *Idolatry* to Worship any Creature



Creature with Divine Worship, to say he is Gods Deputy and Commissioner, and therefore Divine Worship is due to him, will as well excuse the *Pagan*; and to say, he is *Mediator* betwixt God and us, will equally excuse the *Papist*, as the *Socinian* Idolatry. But by the same reason that we allow the same kind of Worship that is due to the Supream God, to our Lord Jesus, must we not acknowledge him to be the Supream God too? *Qui rogat ille facit*: Therefore, by giving him the same Worship, do not we make him the same God, proportionably to the Worship we give him: The highest kind, to the Supream or Highest God.

*Volkelius*, having raised his Admiration of our Saviour with the Consideration of the many Excellencies and Honours God had given him, breaks out with these words; *Quis, inquam, Hunc Divino Honore dignissimum non existimet, ideoque Sanctissimo Cultu non officiat?* Who would not count him worthy of Divine Honour, and pay him the most Holy Worship? But would *Volkelius* say, he was not a Creature still? That spoils his Rhetorick and Argument too.

If it be said, that tho' Christ be but a Creature, yet if God Commands us to Worship him with the same Worship that is due to himself, 'tis then no Idolatry; 'tis our duty to do so. This is said by some, but without Proof or Credit. It imposeth upon the *Almighty*, as if he had done that, which he hath Sworn he will not do, *viz. Give his glory to another*. I see no way left for them to escape the charge of Idolatry, but to acknowledge our Saviour to be more than a Creature, as we do; or to deny him the Honour due to God, as their Brethren of the other Perswasion do: for the reason and definition of Idolatry is Eternal and Immutable, and Inflexible, and will not bend to any of their new Notions or subtile Invasions.

*Seachlingius* upon the first to the *Romans*, speaks home; the Apostle, saith he, teacheth, That the Creator only, *Exclusis omnibus Creaturis*, is to be Religiously Worshipped, and that it is a Sin either to neglect to Worship the Creator, or to joyn Religious Worship to the Creature, with the Worship of the Creator. Now, who could have said any thing better? And yet who could defend his own great Opinion more absurdly and weakly against this confessed Doctrine of the great Apostle? All that he offers is this; That, notwithstanding

God hath given this Worship and Honour to Christ, tho' a Creature: But where hath God alter'd the Nature of, or dispenced with *Idolatriy*? Where doth it appear, that God hath chang'd his Vow'd purpose, and given his Glory to a Creature? Doth not the plain Doctrine both of the Old and New Testament; and many examples both of Men and Angels, and the very Natures of God and the Creature, and the sense of all Mankind, reprove his Vanity, and forbid any Credit to be given to his empty evasion that so evidently contradicts the Apostles Text, and his own observation upon it.

In *Matth.* 4. 10. p. 189.

*Eras.* 17. and 100. *Wolzog* and *Smalcins* speak out indeed, The *First* is bold to say, That Divine Worship, which is due to the most high God, is now due to Christ; and before, was to be given to *Angels*, *Jure Meritoque*, as their just desert. And the *Second* as confidently assures us, that God may Command that any one of the Angels may be Worshipped *Pro Deo*, for God. And he calls the Angels *Dii Caelestes*, to whom Divine Worship may be given, and was actually under the Law. The ground of this Confidence is only this, *Quod omnis Legatus Sustinet personam Mittentis*, and the same Honour is due to him that is sent, by Virtue of his very Commission.

Now, here our Divines subvert the ground of this Confidence; First, by denying the matters of Fact, That the *Angels* were Worshipped with Divine Worship, much less by Gods own Permission or Precept, in the time of the *Law*, which they boldly impose without proof.

Again, we answer, if God cannot deny himself, he cannot Command a Creature to be Worshipped *Pro Deo*, for himself, and give his *Glory to another*; and he hath sworn, if he can, he will not.

Further, this Ancient right of *Angels* to be so Worshipped, if it were proved, would serve indeed to extenuate the guilt of *Papist Idolatriy*, who distinguish of their Worship, and deny in their Doctrine, what these so shamelessly assert, That the Worship due to God can be due to any Creature; but cannot reach the height of this *Socinian* Doctrine, that without *Distinction*, Divine Worship, or as they speak, the Worship due to the most *High God*, may *Jure & merito*, be given to a Creature.

Notwithstanding their Reason, that they bear the *Person* of God

God himself as his *Delegates* and *Commissioners*. For this doth not make them really *Gods*, i. e. proper Objects of Divine Honour: Or if the Argument were good, it would go a great way farther, than they themselves would have any colour to allow. For then, not only *Angels*, but the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, and every *Minister* being sent by God, as his Legates and Missioners, have Right to the same Worship that is due to God that sends them, as well as Angels; this sufficiently shames the Argument: Yet 'tis further observed, that tho' St. Peter was our Saviours Legate to *Cornelius*, yet he with some Zeal for his God, refused the *Adoration*; saying, *Arise, for I my self am a Man also*, not suffering him to comply with the *Socinian* Doctrine, contrary to the standing fence against Temptations to *Idolatry* used by our Saviour: 'tis written, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, as we noted before; and cannot too often think upon, while we have to do with such Adversaries and Arguments.

But that we may have full proof, that these men dare venture to say any thing to save their *Hypothesis*. They take courage, and say, That 'tis no *Idolatry* to give Divine Worship to a Creature, for this incomprehensible reason: *Non certum est*, as saith *Smalcus*, *Deum ob Naturam Divinam, præcise Colendum esse*: i. e. 'Tis not certain that 'tis morally due to God, to be Worshipped with a Worship worthy of God. 'Tis not of Nature but by *Positive Law*, to give the Supream God, Supream Honour: This is such a stretch of Reason or Confidence, as 'tis pity to answer or reflect upon. If there be any thing *Moral* in the *Decalogue*, certainly this is it, *Thou shalt have none other God but me*; namely, to give Divine Worship to. If there be any such thing as *Natural Religion*, these are the undoubted branches of it, that there is a God, and that he ought to be Worshipped, and as a God too, *Purâ mente Colendus*, if there be any duty resulting from the Relation of a Creature to its Creator, 'tis this, to give him the Service and Honour of its Maker, when Men are driven to such a pass of invention and shift, they have abundantly exposed their Cause themselves, and 'tis time to leave them under this Conviction; that, notwithstanding all their subterfuges, seeing they allow the same Honour and Worship to the Creature (without *Distinction*) that is due to the chief God, as they express it, they are guilty of *Idolatry* in a fouler and more scandalous manner than the *Papists* are. q. e. d.

## S E C T. IV.

*Why Socinus Adored Christ, his Arguments against David, for it prepared for.*

**T**HUS we are lead to the *Second* enquiry proposed, *wiz.* Why the *Socinians* allow our Saviour, tho' a mere Creature in their Opinion, the same Honour and Worship which is due to the Supream God.

This is an inquiry of considerable moment; for it must be acknowledged that *Socinus* and his Followers herein, are Men of admirable Reason; and unless it were for some important end or purpose, they would not at once deny a Truth which every one else agree in; namely, That Religious Worship is due only to the Supream God; and yet affirm, that it may even in the *same* degree or kind be given to Christ, tho' a meer Creature. To say, they do this only to avoid the *Scandal* of dishonouring our Lord, and offending other Christians, as *Blandrat* seems to intimate to *Socinus*; seems too weak an account of this weighty matter; seeing that might at least, in part have been avoided, by distinguishing of Worship, as the *Papists* do; but they do not.

The plain truth seems to be this; the Holy *Scriptures* abound with Arguments for the Worshipping of Christ as God; so glaring, he could not outface them, tho' herein *Socinus* seemsevidently to deny his own *Reason*, in reverence to *Revelation*, which is rare in him; and to destroy his own dear *Hypothesis*, as well as confute his Adversary.

For while he allows truly Religious Worship to be given to our Saviour, he thereby grants him to be more than a Creature; that is the Supream God, both in the *Reason* of the thing, the natural *Consequence* of his Concession, and in the just sentence of the other *Socinian* Party, I mean *Fr. David* and his Adherents.

Here I crave leave to fix my foot, and with these other kind of *Unitarians* I do affirm, and am provided to maintain, if need be, that *Socinus* and his Followers, must either acknowledge our Saviour to be *more* than a Creature, and become an *Orthodox* Christian in this point; or that they are *Idolaters* in a more Scandalous manner than the *Papists*; seeing they make  
to

to themselves a *God* of a *Creature*, by ascribing the Worship due to the Supream to their *Creature-God*; and seeing they professedly Worship *Two Gods*, let them no longer glory in the Name of *Unitarians*, but leave it for *Turks* and *Jews*, who better deserve it.

But I must beg leave to digress a little on *Socinus's* part, who hath as effectually baffled *Francis David* by clear Scripture Proof, that our Saviour is to be Religiously Worship'd; as the said *David* was too hard for *Socinus* in the other point; that our Saviour being supposed to be a meer Creature, it is Idolatry so to Worship him, and if he ought so to be Worshipped, he is more then a Creature, *i. e.* Truly a *God*.

I find this Argument hath put some to second thoughts; they begin to startle and are afraid of *Idolatry*: And therefore say, that some *Unitarians* are contrary minded; and believe our Saviour ought not to be Religiously Worshipped and Adored as *God*: And this is the side, to which they seem now to lean, for fear of *Idolatry*.

'Tis for the sake of these chiefly, that I desire to dilate a little about this great Article, and I earnestly beseech them seriously to weigh a few things before they determine themselves in it.

*First*, You change sides for the worse: You leave your Master *Socinus*, who was certainly more like a Christian, and cleave to *David* and his party, that are more open and desperate Enemies of our Lord and Saviour.

*Secondly*, You lean to a Party that brandeth the first and great founder of *Socinianism* with gross *Idolatry*; and to avoid *Idolatry*, by giving Christ more than you think is due; you come within the peril of *Sacrilege*, and rob him of that which is of right due to him.

*Thirdly*, Consider, if it do appear that Christ ought to be Religious Adored and Worshipped; the Consequence is irresistible in *Francis Davids* Judgment, as well as in the thing it self: *We cannot*, saith he, *Adore the Son, unless we suppose Christ to be in the Father, and the Father in Christ, Unitate-Essentia, by unity of Essence.*

*Fourthly and Lastly*, Seriously consider the Arguments of *Socinus* himself (and we need no other) before you leave him, in so great a point, wherein he is certainly in the right; that Christ ought to be Religiously Adored and Worshipped, what ever the consequence may be.

Seeing



Seeing you incline to believe that *David's* point is well fixed ; and that Religiously to Adore and Worship any Creature is *Idolatry*, as we have all along maintained : If *Socinus* make good his point too, That Christ is to be Religiously Adored and Worshipped, let the *Orthodox* truth find its way by these lights ; and preserve or recover its place, in our Faith as good Christians, touching our Saviours Divinity.

## S E C T. V.

*Socinus and his Parties Arguments, that Christ is to be Religiously Worshipped.*

LET us now take a brief Survey of *Socinus* and his parties Arguments to prove, that we may and ought to give Religious Adoration and Worship to our Saviour. They do it sufficiently under these Three Heads. *Profit*, *Necessity*, and *Example*.

1. *Profit*. 1. 'Tis our *Interest* and consequently our *Wisdom* thus to Worship him. The *Rac. Catechist* teacheth, That *We should believe, that Christ is able to do all things ; and that, if we seek his favour, he will do us good, and perform all his promises to us ; and infer, thence, that We ought to trust in Christ in the same manner as we ought to trust in God. Again, they say, We may direct our Prayers to him in all our necessities, because he both can and will help us, and he understands our Prayers.*
2. *Necessity*. 2. 'Tis our necessary Duty both with respect to his Person, and the Law of his Father : *Socinus* himself infers a necessity of Praying to Christ, because of the Kingdom, Power and Government given to him, as before we observed : And in the Law of the Gospel, to pray to Christ, is made the very Condition of Salvation. *Socinus* acknowledgeth (against *Fr. David*) that passage in the Prophet, *Joel 2. 32. Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved*, is justly applied to Christ, by the Apostle in *Rom. 10. 13. Yea, this is the very Character* the Holy Scriptures give us of a *Christian*, he is one that calls on the Name of Christ, *Act. 14. 9. 1 Cor. 1. 2. 2 Tim. 2. 22.* and their own *Catechism* asserts peremptorily, as we noted before, that they are no *Christians* that will not pray to Christ ; who tell us plainly and expressly, that 'tis our Duty to Worship him, and prove it from, *Jeb. 5. 22, 23. All should honour the Son as they honour the Father.*

3. Their

3. Their *Catechism* assures us, that we may pray unto Christ because we have several Instances of Holy Men, who have done so. His *own Disciples* prayed unto him, when he was upon the *Earth* for *Temporal* deliverance: *Lord save us we perish*, Matth. 8. 25. And even for *Spiritual* Grace: *Lord increase our Faith*. And after he was gone to *Heaven*, St. Paul the great Apostle of the *Gentiles*, that disputed so effectually against *Pagan Idolatry*, pray'd unto him more then once, 1, saith he, *besought the Lord* thrice, and his Lord assured him, he did well in so doing, in this gracious answer, *My grace is sufficient for thee*, 2 Cor. 10. 7, 8, 9. So far *Socinus* himself; his followers further observe, that the same *Apostle* joyns Christ with God the *Father*, in his prayer mentioned to the *Thessalonians*, *Now God himself and our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you*; and at other times, does the same in effect, in his *Salutations* to the several Churches when he wisheth them, *Grace, Mercy and Peace* equally from God the Father and the *Lord Jesus Christ*: These instances, I hope are sufficient, I shall add one more, and that is a very plain one; and one would imagine beyond exception: 'Tis St. *Stephen* praying in these words, *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit*, Act. 7. 59. but behold the fineness of *Fr. Davids* Invention; saith he, 'tis *κύριε Ἰησοῦ*; and because *Ἰησοῦ* may be either the *Genitive* or the *Vocative* Case, according to the usual art of *Socinian* reasoning, it must be taken in that sence, that will best serve a *Turn*, tho' never so alien or contrary to the true interpretation, and the *Reason* of the Context, he must have it, *Lord of Jesus*, or else it will prove either that 'tis Lawful to Worship our Saviour; and to pray unto him; or this first *Martyr* died with *Idolatry* in his mouth.

But this *Criticism* is not so fine, as 'tis forced and absurd. The Learned observe, that if [*Jesus*] had been the *Genitive* Case, the *Article* would have been added; 'twould have been *κύριε ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. We find the same words *Rev.* 22. 20. and there they cannot bear the sence of the *Genitive*, and must be understood in the *Vocative* Case: But, besides the ilness of the *Grammer*, the harshness of the *Sence*, and the *Novelty* of this rare discovery; two or three things might abate the Authors confident boasting of this Invention: The *Syriac* is beyond the reach of it, *Domine Noster Jesu*. Some Copies have it plainer yet, and Read it, *κύριε Χριστέ*, O Lord Christ. And their admired *Grotius's* gloss is utterly inconsistent with it, *Invocantem nempe Jesum Christum*. But why should I trouble my Reader any farther about this Ridiculous shift of *David*, which you may find was long since exposed and baffled by *Socinus* himself in a very strenuous confutation of

it, which its Author *David* had never courage or skill enough, to encounter again, that I can find.

Now my Brethren consider, 'tis eternal Reason, that Religiously to Worship any Creature is *Idolatry*, but we have found it the common practice of the best men in *Scripture*, thus Religiously to Worship our Saviour Christ it seems to follow clearly, that either these Holy Men so doing, were *Idolaters*, or our Saviour Christ is more then a meér Creature, that is, he is the *True God*. I know you will deny the *First*: I heartily wish you would confesse the *Second*, it would be so far well betwixt us.

However, you do not undertake to defend the part of *Socinus* from *Idolatry*, more haynous then that of the *Papists*; which I hope I have demonstrated sufficiently before.

## C H A P. II.

*The Socinians Antiscripturist, as truly as, if not more then the Papists.*

HAVING ended our *First Parrable*, betwixt the *Socinian* and *Papist*, with respect to the *Term* of Worship, we come next to compare them with respect to their *Rule of Faith*, the *Canonical Books* of the Holy Scriptures.

Herein also they both concur, viz. In their endeavours to undermine their Authority: And when they think they have occasion so to do, they lay this *Rule* aside, and set up another of their own, in the stead of it.

That the *Papists* do so the *Socinians* readily grant; and that the *Socinians* do like the *Papists* and exceed them therein, is as easily demonstrated.

## S E C T. I.

*The Papists vilifies the Holy Scripture.*

I. FOR the *Papists*, the World is sensible enough, how vilely they deal with this *Rule* of the Holy Scriptures, and make them indeed, as they sometimes call them, *A Nose of Wax*, and a *Lead Rule*: They take upon them to sence them as they please; and use

use them only as *Tools* to serve a turn, and little otherwise.

Sometimes, they will admit nothing but the bare *Words*, without any reasonable Construction of them; when they would advance their *Transubstantiation*. At other times, when the proper and *Literall Sense* is against them, O then the Scripture is a *Killing*, a *Dead Letter*, and must receive its *Life* and *Sense* from their *Churches Interpretation*, how wild and absurd soever it be to serve their *Hypothesis*.

Thus, when they have disparaged, slighted, and set aside the *True Rule*, 'tis no wonder they introduce and obtrude another *Rule* of their own devising, which they do not only make equal with it, but prefer before it; I mean their *Oral Tradition*, and the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*: Yea, when they seem to allow the *Holy Scriptures* any *Authority*, they at the same time rob them of it, by transferring that *Authority* to themselves, their own *Sence* and *Sentiments*, tho' diverse from, and even contrary to the *Letter*, or plain and obvious meaning of the *Written Word*.

## S E C T. II.

*The Socinians vilifie the Scripture more then Papists.*

WHILE I have been speaking of the *Papist*, I have given you but an imperfect draught and *Character* of a *Socinian* in this point: Verily, the *Papist* seems to be the honestest of the two: His is an open and down-right attacking and villifying those *Holy Books*; while the *Socinian* doth it in disguise, and wounds it deeper; lies in its *Bosom*, and stabs it to the *Heart*; and with splended Colours of Honouring, and Arguments proving its *Divine Original* and *Authority*, makes it utter *Non-sense*, bad *sense*, or any *sence*, that their cause requires.

Now seeing these men, in other things, are *Masters* of a great deal of Reason; it may be worth a Question, whether their Writing so much for the *Divine Authority* of the *Holy Scriptures*, be from a real Opinion of the Truth of it, or only in *pretence*, to serve their own purpose, and varnish their designs: For, how is it possible, if their Opinion of it were *Real*, they should use it so slightly, and after so trifling a manner, as 'tis pitty, to see they do.

With how much gravity and solemn circumstances, do they make the Word of God *Felo dese*; not so much by *opposing*, as by *Apposing* one part to another; and by the idlest *Phantasies*, or an odd kind of skill peculiar to themselves, make a *weaker* text, take off the life and

sense of a *Stronger*, and by a *likeness*, or sameness, or nearness of expression (when there is no other reason in the World for it) to enervate the strength of the best Arguments it affords, for the *God-head* of Christ, and the *Sacred Trinity*.

To make this out beyond exception, give me leave only to mention some Instances of it: The mention only, is shame and reproach enough, one would think, as well as confutation, in the sense of an *Indifferent* or modest Man.

1. When we prove *Three Persons* and each of them *God*, from the great *Commission* for *Propagating* the *Christian Church*, by *Baptizing* in the *Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: They gravely answer, and would have us take it for a full Answer; That 'tis said, the *Israelites* were *Baptized into Moses and in the Cloud*; and that they believed in *God, and his Servant Moses*.

2. When we urge, *John* 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word*; they reply that it must signifie, the *Beginning* of the *Gospel* or *New Creation*: And their proof is, because we read [*from the Beginning*] in that latter sense, *Luk.* 1. 2. and 1 *John* 1. 1.

3. When to prove our Saviour's *Incarnation*, we use the Apostles words, *Job.* 1. *The Word was made Flesh*; they say, we must not understand by *Flesh* there, the *Humane Nature*, but a State of *Infirmity*; because in that sense, the word [*Flesh*] is somewhere else to be understood.

4. Where our Saviour tells us, *John* 18. 28. *That he and his Father are one*; They say, that is, they are one only in *Will* and *Consent*, forsooth, because our Saviour Prays, *Job.* 17. that his Disciples *may be one, as he and his Father are one*; i. e. Not in *Nature*, but in mind and heart: and this must be all the meaning of our Saviour in the place we have mentioned, notwithstanding the obvious evidence of the Text to the contrary, viz. That he and his Father are one, in *Power*, and consequently in *Nature*.

This is not only the general Sense of the *Fathers*, that weighs little with *Socinians*; but also of their admired *Grotius* and *Erasmus*, whom they claim for their own. *Si pereant meâ infirmitate. Patris potestas mea potestas*; my Fathers Power, is my Power, *Grot. in Loc. Potentior est ad servandum, Eras. in Loc.*

5. So our Lord Christ must be a *God* by *Office* only, and not by *Nature*, Why? Because they find *Kings* and *Magistrates* are called *Gods*.

6. When we read *Col.* 1. 16. That by Christ were Created all things that are in *Heaven* and that are in *Earth*, whether visible and invisible; whether they be *Thornes*, &c. all things were created by him and for him:

They



They restrain all this to the *Second* Creation or Reformation of Mankind, and those great words signifies onely *Men*, and *Orders* of Men on *Earth*: Confounding Heaven and Earth, visible and invisible, denying any thing that looks against them; and not sticking to say any thing that their *Hypothesis* seems to need.

7. The Name *Emmanuel*, with so much solemnity given by an *Angel* from Heaven to Christ, doth not signifie the *Union* of the Divine and Humane Nature in him; because others might have been called so before, as since some have; as *Eniedine* gravely instanceth in *Emmanuel Tremelius*. These things are childish and Rediculous, and deserve a severe Reflection, not any serious confutation.

### S E C T. III.

#### Socinian *Chriticisms* in *Articles*.

**T**HUS the *Socinians* bandy the Scriptures one against another; and 'tis hard to think that they believe themselves to be in earnest, while they are found *Ludere cara sacra*, and impose such childrens play, tho' never so solemnly upon the World; especially, if we consider their School-boys *Criticisms*; and that, with a little *Poinr*, or a small *Article*, they would weaken and destroy the Arguments of the greatest and strongest Texts in the Word of God against them; wherein, indeed the *Arians* lead them the way.

They are both of them confident, that when *Θεός*, signifies the *Father*, 1 *Articles*. or the Supream God, in Scripture, it hath its *Article* always before it; but when the *Son* is called *Θεός*, 'tis without an *Article* prefix'd to it. A mighty fine observation; this sufficient doubtless, to evacuate one of the clearest and strongest Arguments for our Lords *Divinity*, to distinguish the Natures of the *Father* and *Son*; and to put a final end to this great Controversie, tho' it hath no foundation in *Reason* or *Grammer*, much less in the *Holy Scripture*, as confident as they are.

Indeed, they truly observe, that by [*Ὁ Θεός, τὸν Θεόν*] in *Joh. 1. 15.* signified God the *Father*, and the *Article* is prefixed; But doth it follow, that 'tis always so? within the compass of two or three verses afterwards, they may see their Observation utterly undone, *viz.* in *ver. 6.* for there the *Father* is call'd God, *Θεός*, without an *Article*. So likewise in *Rom. 7. 1.* the *Son* is, *Rom. 9.* call'd *ὁ Θεός* with an *Article*: And if *Θεός*, without an *Article* is found to signifie God the *Father*, Why may it not signifie the God-head of the *Son* likewise, tho' it have not an *Article* before it?

*Eraſmus* on *Rom. 9. 5.* would help them to avoid the force of that great

great Text, for the proof of our Lords Divinity, with a *Point*, which looks like *Push-pin* Divinity indeed: *Punctum post oculum vel post unguem*, choose you whether. But *Erasmus* himself confesseth, that without these *Nicities* in *Pointing*, all the *Greek* Copies have it as we read it; and refers the Relative  $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  to Christ, which is plainly more agreeable, as the *Learn'd* observe, both to the *Scope* of the *Apostle*, and the *Series* of the words.

Besides, 'Tis worthy our observation, that tho' *Erasmus* is not forward to own, that Christ is here meant, but thinks God here, signifies, and is to be taken, *vel pro totâ Triade, vel persona Patris*, yet by the same Words, he confesseth the *Trinity*; and consequently the *Deity* of the Son, as he doth afterwards more expressly, on those two famous Texts, *Phil. 2. 6.* and *Heb. 1. 6.* where these are his words upon the first of them, *q. d. Qui cum esset & sit, non usurpatorius, sed verus Deus, non estimavit equalitatem Dei sibi esse rapinam*: and on the Second, *Et etate præcedit, quia æternus, & dignitate, quia Naturalis*, The *Eternal* and *Natural* Son of God, which is enough to vindicate *Erasmus*, from being either *Arian* or *Socinian*: How ever some boast to the contrary; we hereby see what credit is to be given them.

'Tis confessed, *Erasmus* notes, that *St. Cyprian* and *Hilary* omit the word [*Deus*] in *Rom. 9. 6.* Yet 'tis concluded by the *Learned*, that it was omitted, not industriously by those eminent *Fathers*, but in *curia Librariorum & res ipsa ostendit*; 'tis evident it must be so, Seeing, both these *Fathers* cite this very *Place*, as a plain proof, that Christ is truly and properly God. *Vid. Pol. Synop. in Loc.*

## S E C T. IV.

*The Socinians Enervate the Authority of Gods Word.*

They farther try their skill to loosen and weaken the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, by *Enervating* the Credit of the Gospel it self, and making the *Apostles*, if not the Lord Jesus too, *impertinent Sophisters*; while they Interpret the proofs, the inspired Writing bring out of the *Old Testament*, to confirm the New, into meer *Allusions* and accomodations of Old Phraises or Expressions, without any further force and use of them. But this lays the Ax at the Root, and is of such import and consequence, that it deserves a larger consideration and reproof, then my present design will conveniently permit.

## S E C T. V.

Socinians have another Rule of their own, which they prefer above the Scripture.

WE have seen how perversly and vilely, the *Socinians* treat the only Rule of the Christian Faith; which yet, will appear more egregiously by our *Second* Observation; that they lay it aside altogether, as a Rule; or measure it by a Rule of their own, which they set up in the room of it, or above, as the *Papist* do.

This *Socinian* Rule, which they measure the Holy Scriptures, viz. The Divine Rule by, is nothing else, but their own private Sense (if not their *Wis* and *Phanſie*) much the same with the *Quakers* Light within, which they call, *Reason*.

I have elsewhere distinguish'd, betwixt a Rule and a Judge; and observ'd, that *these* are not the same, but two distinct things, with respect to Religion: I shall explain and apply them more fully in the present Argument.

We must in order hereunto distinguish, betwixt *Natural* and *Revealed* Religion, as such. 1. Explain'd

1. I grant, with respect to meer *Natural* Religion, Reason seems to be both a Rule and a Judge, for we have nothing without our selves, that can well be conceived, to be either we know nothing of it, but the rational Notices, which Humane understanding suggest; or the Dictates of pure Reason called forth, or occasioned by the works of Creation and Providence.

2. But *Revelation*, being, from without us, is therefore a Rule imposed on us from without; and must be distinct from Reason, which is within us and part of our selves? and consequently, tho' Reason be a Judge, it must Judge of *Revealed* Religion, by a Rule from without us; which is another thing, and not our Reason: I mean, we must Judge of *Revealed* Religion as such, by that Rule by which that Religion is only made known to us, that is the *Holy Scriptures*; and then, 'tis no wonder, if all our Religion as *Christian*, or *Revealed*, be not dictated or to be comprehended by *Natural Reason*. For if Reason had discovered all before, What need of *Revelation*? And indeed, those that say, all our Religion, lies within the compass of Reason, are in a fair way to reject all *Revelation*; and to advance the *Natural* or *Pagan* Religion in the World, in the room of the *Christian*.

But

But seeing *Socinus* (tho' erroneously) supposeth, the *Being* of a God, could not have been discovered without *Tradition* or *Revelation*, how absurd doth it seem (for him especially) to imagine, that things that can be known only by *Revelation*, can be known or may be measured by *Reason*, or any other Rule, but *Revelation*, or the Writing in and by which they are made known to Reason it self, as *Sensible* Objects, being to be known only so far as *Sence* represents them to our imagination, can have no other Rule by which our *Reason* can Judge or measure them but our *Sences*.

And, seeing our *Revelation* is from Heaven, we must not only acknowledge the *Being* of such a Rule, but the *Fulness*, Rectitude, and *Authority* of it; by which, all the rules of *Reason* are to be determined, even in such things as reason falls short of, and could not have been any other way discovered; or being discovered, cannot be apprehended, but as they are Reveiled: if this be not granted, where is the Authority or Divinity of that *Higher Rule*, which is given by God, to be the only Rule and Standard of the *Christian Religion* as such?

It hence follows, that this *Divine Rule* being supposed, Reason my Judge of it, but by no means, presume to Judge it, so as to question, mind, alter, correct, or lay it aside, or advance it self above it.

We must indeed, judge by *Reason*, what the things are that are so reveiled; we must measure all *Articles* imposed on us, by our Reason indeed; yet the Rule by which we are to do so, is only the Word of God: To exalt Reason or the inward rules or dictates of it, to be the measure of things reveild, is to lay aside the *True Rule*, or to judge God himself in the Authority of his holy word.

A *Humane Judge*, hath likewise his Rule without him, viz. The *Publick Laws*: and if he should make his private Sentiments of Justice and Right, the rule of his Judgment, he falls under his Superiors and every Mans Censure: 'Tis not his Office, to question, or mend, or any way alter, much less abrogate the Law; but he is only *Jus dicere*, to declare and apply the Laws in his Jurisdiction; not to judge the Laws by the Rule of his own Reason, but to use his Reason, to know and understand, and to pass Judgment according to the Laws: much less, are we to question the reasonableness or equity of Gods Laws; or judge them unreasonable or *unfit* for reasonable Creatures to give credit to; because they seem not to square with our Natural reason: This were to believe *our selves* and not God, to exalt our selves above God, yea to discredit and make God a *Liar*.

I am sorry we have so much reason to apply all this to Socinus and his Followers : how shall we forbear to arraign Arrogance, with the *Apostles* words, *Thou art not a doer of the Law but a Judge. Who art thou, O vain Man, that repliest against God.* Is it not a marvellous thing to see poor ignorant lapsed Man to erect a Tribunal against his Maker ; and with a shadow of Carnal Reason to sit in judgment upon *Gods Word* ? and to level the greatest *Articles* of the *Christian Faith*, to their own shallow and partial apprehensions ? And yet thus the *Socinian* aspires with his presumptuous Reason, to dogmatize upon Revelation : To judge the *Messias*, and all his concerns : His *Generation*, *Incarnation*, *Natures*, *Offices*, *Passion*, *Satisfaction*, *Mediation* and *Intercession* : To Judge and Condemn the *Holy Ghost*, and the ever *Blessed Trinity* ; and to measure the *Resurrection* of our Bodies by the Model of his private apprehension.

Yet this sort of Men, shew great Reverence to, and very strongly argue the Divine Authority of the *Holy Scriptures* : And they do not deny, but these great *Articles* are matters of pure *Revelation* in the same Scriptures : Neither can they evince any one of these great and mysterious Points, are repugnant to *Sence* or *Reason*, or any other part, of *Gods Word*.

Men should have methinks, so much modesty as to judge, that their corrupt *Reason* is as fallible as the *Holy Pen-Men* : Or, That it may be reasonable we should have a Rule *without* to Discipline and bound our extravagant *Phantasies* in matters of *Faith* : Or that private reason, may be mistaken in judging that a *Contradiction*, which the *Church of God*, I mean the generallity of *Christians*, *Semper & ubique* could never discover, and have hitherto verily believed, that it is none.

I think 'tis plain, from what hath been said, that the *Socinian* falls in with the *Papist*, and goes beyond him, not only in villifying and laying aside the True Rule of *Faith*, but in setting up another Rule of his own instead of it : They both are guilty, only with this difference : The *Papist's* Rule, is the *Publick Reason* and sence of his Church ; The *Socinians* Rule is his own, and every particular Mans private *Reason*, and which of these is the wiser and safer, let every Mans Reason judge.

That I do not herein wrong the *Socinian*, almost all their Books have something in them to bear me Witness. Let *Smalcus* more then once be heard for the rest, First, in that famous place of his.

*Credimus inquit, etiam si non semel atque iterum, sed satis crebro, & Tom. 1.*  
*Apartissime, Scriptum extaret, Deum esse hominem factum, multo satius Disp. 6.*  
*esse, quia hæc res sit absurda & sanæ Rationi plane contraria, & in Deum Sect. 63.*  
*blasphemia.*



*blasphema, modum aliquem dicendi comministi, quo ista de Deo dici, quam ista simpliciter ita ut verba sonant, intelligere. i. e. Tho we find it declared in Scripture, not only once and again, but very often, and very plainly, That God was made Man; because this is absurd, and plainly contrary to sound Reason and Blasphemous against God; We believe, saith he, that it is much better to find out some mode of speaking, according to which one may say this concerning God, then so interpret things simply and according to the Letter.*

Smal Hom.

8. in c. 1.

7.

Jon. p. 89.

Again, let us hear him to the same purpose, if not more plainly in another place. *Nullam Esse Religionis particulam quæ cum ratione non Conveniat: Et quæ cum Ratione non Convenit opinio, eam etiam in Theologia nullum locum habere posse:* That is, that there is no small point in Religion which doth not agree with Reason: And whatsoever Opinion doth not agree with Reason, can have no place even in Religion.

What can this signifie? But that when an Article of Faith is plainly revealed in the Word of God, if it square not with Socinian Reason, we must reject the evidence of Gods Authority, and hearken to Reason: That is in plain English, Reason, and not the Scripture, is both the Judge and Rule of Socinian Faith.

I must conclude with an excellent passage or two, in that incomparable Book of our Great Primate lately Printed, called his Sermons concerning the Divinity, &c. of our Saviour. 'I do readily grant, saith he, pag. 79. that the Socinian Writers have managed the Cause of the Reformation against the Church of Rome, with great acuteness and advantage in many respects: But I am sorry to have cause to say, that they have likewise put into their hands, better and sharper Weapons then ever they had before, for the weakning and undermining of the Holy Scriptures, which Socinus indeed hath in the general strongly asserted; had he not by a dangerous liberty of imposing a Forreign and forced Sence upon particular Texts, brought the whole into uncertainty.

p. 78. 79.

'Again (saith he) to speak freely, I must needs say, that it seems to me a much fairer way to reject the Divine Authority of a Book, then to use it so disingenuously, and to wrest the plain expressions of it, with so much straining and violence from their most Natural and Obvious sence: For no Doctrine whatsoever can have any certain Foundation in any Book, if this liberty be once admitted, without regard to the plain Scope and Occasion of it, to play upon the Words and Phrases with all the Arts of Criticism, and with all the variety of Allegory which a brisk and lively imagination can devise.

## C H A P. III.

*The Foundation of Socinianism, Fanatical as well as of the Papacy.*

WE have seen the *Parallel*, with respect to the *Term* of *Worship*, and the *Rule of Faith*: We are now come to consider how the *Socinian* and the *Papist* agree in the *Foundation of their Religion*.

I know, the pretenders to so much *Reason*, who make *Reason* to be both the *Judge* and *Rule* of their *Religion*, will ill bear the *Title of Fanatics* and *Enthusiasts*; but 'tis possible, that even such may be found, *vel, cum, vel, sine, Ratione Insanire*. If the *Socinian* appear to do so, he must not take it ill, to be rank'd with the *Papist* in this charge also, and equally accused of *Unreasonable Religion*, no better than *Fanaticism*, or *Enthusiasm*, as well as *Idolatry* and *Antiscripturism*.

That this charge may appear fair and just; I shall first describe what I mean by *Fanaticism* and *Enthusiasm*, or *Enthusiastical Fanaticism*, and then, I shall apply it to our present Subjects, the *Papist* and *Socinian*, and see their agreement in it.

## S E C T. I.

*Fanaticism Described.*

MODERN *Fanaticism* and *Enthusiasm*, I reckon to be nothing else, but a *Religion* (if it deserve the Name) that hath no *Foundation*, either in the *Word of God* or *sound Reason*, but is founded in *Dreams* or *Phantasies*, or pretended *Inspiration*, or *Divine Revelation* besides, and other than the *Holy Scriptures*: Now, whether I err in this *Idea* or *Character of Fanaticism* or no, yet I am sure, that *Religion* that may be thus described, is a *Wild* or a *Mad* sort of *Religion*, *Socinians* themselves being *Judges*: Such is the *Religion* founded by *Maabomet*, and is *Fanatical* and *Enthusiastical* plain enough, as all *Christians* acknowledge: And whether the *Papacy* as such is much better, is doubted by all *Learned Protestants*; and how far *Socinianism* is liable to the same *Condemnation*, is to be enquired presently.

## S E C T. II.

## Fanaticism the Foundation of Popery.

Bishop of  
Worcester.

**B**UT, First, for the *Papacy*, as such that this hath no Foundation in *Scripture* or *Reason*; That 'tis founded only in *Dreams* and *Phantasies*, and pretended *Inspiration* or *Revelation*, will be easily granted, if we consider how their several *Orders* were first founded, namely in *Fanatical Enthusiasm*, as is most evidently demonstrated, by the excellent paines of a most *Learned Prelate* of our own now living. Moreover, the very root of the *Papacy* it self, hath no better ground, I mean their *Popes Supremacy*, as *St. Peters* pretended Successor, is nothing but dream and *Phanfie*; or which is worse, affected *Arrogance* and *Presumption*, or precarious and violent *Imposition* upon the *Christian World*; because they found it absolutely necessary for the support of a rotten or unsound Building. And being without the help, either of *Scripture* or sound *Reason* it rests only upon, and resolves at last, into a feined *Will* of *St. Peter*, that was never proved *per testes*, by lawful *Witnesses*.

Doubtless the *Papacy* is *Fanatical* from top to bottom; but how doth it appear, that *Socinianism* is so. This is the next enquiry.

## S E C T. III.

## Fanaticism at the bottom of Socinianism.

**T**O be clear in this enquiry, we must consider the *Fundamental* point, on which the *Socinian Religion* as such, chiefly if not entirely rests, and from whence it ariseth: and 'tis plainly this, whether our *Saviour* had a being before he was born of the *Virgin Mary*: On this, hang all the great questions, touching our *Lords Filiation*, *Naturis*, *Divinity*, *Merit*, *Satisfaction* and *Intercession*; and are decided and determined, as that stands or falls.

Now, this great point, whether our *Saviour* had a being before he was born of the *Virgin*, hath an essential dependance on another, which of absolute necessity must be evinced before, in order to the determination of this, and therefore this other point lies deeper in the *Foundation*, seeing upon it depends that Resolution, whether our *Saviour* had a being before he was born of the *Virgin* or no; and that is, whether our *Saviour* had a Being with his *Father* in *Heaven* before he

he was born of the Virgin, or whether he had not been in Heaven before, but ascended or was taken up thither only, after he was so born and had been sometime in the Flesh.

Now, the *Holy Scriptures* abounding with so many plain proofs that our Saviour *came down from Heaven* (Nine or Ten times asserted in that one Chapter, the Sixth of St. *John*) *Socinus* and his Followers dare not, do not deny it. But 'tis so essential to their Religion, to deny that our Saviour had any Being before he was Born of the Virgin, and in consequence, to support their whole *Fabrick* upon this *Hypothesis*, they at last found out a *Salvo*, to reconcile the contradiction; tho' at first they had different Notions and did hesitate about it, yet at last they seem to agree, and do now *unanimously* affirm; that after our Saviour was born of the *Virgin*, he *was taken up into Heaven*; and then coming down again, he is said to *come down from Heaven* so often, in the *Scriptures*.

Then this is the very *Root*, *Foundation*, and *Corner Stone*, upon which *Socinianism* is framed and supported, that our Saviour, after he was born of the *Virgin* was taken up (in the *Flesh*) into *Heaven*, to receive instructions from his Father for the *Salvation* of *Mankind*.

Now (to apply to our purpose) if this great point, upon *Application* which *Socinianism* so intirely depends, have no *Foundation*, either in the *Word* of God or sound *Reason*; and be founded only in *Dream* or *Phanſie*, or presumptive *Invention* to save the *Fabrick*, their great *Hypothesis* from sinking; or rather in pretended *Inspiration* or *Revelation*; is not *Socinianism*, as truly *Phanatical* and *Enthusiastical*, as the *Papacy*; not to say *Mahometism*?

If they are so daring as to affirm, 'tis to be found in the *Scripture*; they ought to be so kind to us, and so just to their *Not in Scripture*. Cause, as to shew us *where*: They seem to make us some resemblance of our Lords *Assention* into Heaven as a Man, in *Moses's* being in the *Mount* with God; and St. *Paul's* *Rapture* into the third Heaven, but it was St. *Paul* and *Moses*; where do we find any such thing said of *Christ*, unless it were upon *Mount Tabor*, but that will not serve their purpose.

'Tis plain our Lord came down from *Heaven*: Our Doctrine is certain, that he was there: And the Text is evident, that he came down from Heaven before he is said to have *Ascended*: And he that came down from Heaven, and was on Earth, in his *Humanity*, was still equally in Heaven, in his *Divinity*:

vinity: all this is plain Scripture, John 3. 13. *No Man hath ascended up into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven; even the Son of Man which is in Heaven.*

But where are we told that our Lord in *Flesh* ascended up into Heaven and then came down again? Certainly, if this be the Truth, that must support so much of Religion, 'twould have been recorded somewhere in the *Scripture*, and not have been reserved in Silence and Mystery.

Especially, seeing the *Socinians* themselves observe, (even with boasting;) the *Fulness*, as well as the *Clearness* of those Holy Writings with respect to every thing *necessary* to be believed; methinks their own great Reason should force them to confess, that so great a point, ought not to be believed by themselves, or obtruded upon the World, seeing it is no *where* to be found in those Sacred Books.

That 'tis not to be found therein, appears evidently by some observations touching the difference among the *Socinians* themselves; and the difficulties they encounter'd with before they resolv'd to be satisfied about it.

*First*, They began to play with the *Scripture*, as they use to do in other matters; and pretended a strange discovery of a *Figurative* Sense; and interpreted our Saviours being in Heaven, either by his Heavenly *Meditations* or *Divine Knowledge*. But when he came down, did he leave behind him his such Meditation and Knowledge? This *Non-sence* *Socius* was soon ashamed of, and came to this Resolution; that our Saviour, after he was in the *Flesh*, did ascend in *Person* into Heaven; but upon the *Time* when he did so, he and his Followers were not agreed.

*Secondly*, This is the Second difficulty, wherein they were plunged; that upon a supposition, that Christ was taken up into Heaven, when it should be. Some of them say, it was, when he was Twelve Years Old, and *when his Parents missed him*, and after three days found him amongst the Doctors: Others of great name amongst them, suppose it was, during his being *Forty days in the Wilderness*, and this now seems to be the general and current Opinion with them: But do these Texts say any thing else, but that our Saviour was in the *Temple* when his Parents sought him; and that he was in the *Wilderness* tempted of the *Devil* (an odd description of Heaven?) these places of Scripture then will not do. Have they any other? We hear of



of no other: and therefore, we may be bold to conclude, there is no ground in *Scripture* for that great *Point*, that is the *Basis* of *Socinian Religion*.

Secondly, Neither in *Reason*, For if it be not Revealed in *Scripture*, 'tis beyond the *Ken* of the most Sagacious, without a good *Invention*, to make a *Discovery* of it, for that which can be known only by *Revelation*, can certainly be known no otherwise; but none can possibly imagine (not the most phaniful *Socinian*) how this matter of *Fact* could ever fall under the rational understanding of any Man, except it were revealed from Heaven. If *Reason* could discover some plausible colour, *Why* our Lord should be taken up into Heaven before his passion, yet certainly, *That* he was so, is matter of pure *Revelation*, and not to be known otherwise. Not in Reason.

We must conclude also, that this their great principle hath no more foundation in sound *Reason*, then in the *Holy Scripture*: That is, none at all. 'Tis unscriptural, and no reason can be given for it, but the necessity of it to support an *Hypothesis*, that falls with it, or without it.

Thirdly and Lastly, To shut up all, 'Tis not only not founded either in *Scripture* or *Reason*, and so *Fanatical* enough; but 'tis pure and *Enthusiasm*, even by their own Confession. How much *Fasting*, how *passional*, much *Study*, what earnest *Prayers* to Almighty God, did *Laelius Socinus* pay for this rare great and notable *Discovery*? But was it any more then *Dream* and *Phansie* (if it deserve not a worse name) tho' it commenced *Enthusiasm*? Fanatick and Enthusiasm.

I shall end with that smart and pertinent *Reflection* of the present Learned *Dean* of *St. Pauls* in his late excellent *Treatise* of the Blessed *Trinity*, p. 143. Speaking of this *Text*, that *Christ* came down from Heaven. Did *Socinus*, saith he, find it so easie a matter to reconcile this *Text* to his darling *Opinion*, when he was fain to fast and pray for it; and pretend *Revelation*, because he wanted *Reason* to support it?

O Merciful GOD who hast made all Men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made, nor wouldest the death of a Sinner, but rather that he should be Converted and live; have Mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heriticks, and take from them all Ignorance, hardness of Heart, and contempt  
of

*of thy Word, and so fetch them home Blessed Lord to thy Flock, that they may be saved among the Remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one Fold under one Shepherd, JESUS CHRIST our Lord, who liveth and Reigneth with Thee and the Holy Spirit, One God, World without End.*

**F I N I S.**

